



Class F

Book 184

.B15T5

Author \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Imprint \_\_\_\_\_

16-27170-3 GPO



*Compliments of*  
*Decourcy W. Thom*

ADDRESS OF

DECOURCY W. THOM,

Of "Blakeford," Queen Anne's County, Maryland,

PRESENTING TO

THE CITY OF BALTIMORE,

ON NOVEMBER 21st, 1908,

IN BEHALF OF

THE SOCIETY OF COLONIAL WARS

in the State of Maryland and of all others  
who participated in the gift,

The Statue in Bronze of Cecilius Calvert,

SECOND LORD BALTIMORE,

THE FOUNDER OF MARYLAND.

PRESS OF KING BROS.,  
PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS,  
1908.



ADDRESS OF  
DECOURCY W. THOM,  
Of "Blakeford," Queen Anne's County, Maryland,

PRESENTING TO  
THE CITY OF BALTIMORE,

ON NOVEMBER 21st, 1908,

IN BEHALF OF  
THE SOCIETY OF COLONIAL WARS  
in the State of Maryland and of all others  
who participated in the gift,

The Statue in Bronze of Cecilius Calvert,  
SECOND LORD BALTIMORE,

THE FOUNDER OF MARYLAND.

---

PRESS OF KING BROS.,  
PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS,  
1908.

F184  
B15T5

GIFT  
MRS. WOODROW WILSON  
NOV. 25, 1939

*Governor Crothers, Our Invited Guests,*

*Ladies and Gentlemen:*

"History is past Politics, and Politics is present History," said a great English Historian. His saying is virtually true, yet among its infelicities is the major one that it seems to emphasize the man-made element in History, and not at all bring to the attention the supreme fact that through the ages one increasing Purpose runs and that in fulness of Time "Good shall be the final end of all." Shall one help onward that Divine Consummation, or shall one retard it? That is really the chiefest test of every life. But though one retard as in the olden days did all but two of that mighty host of the "Chosen Nation" unto whom was promised the land of Palestine flowing with milk and honey, yet shall the promise be kept unto the nation, though in it there shall yet survive of the original wayfarers, only two who have steadfastly helped achieve the divinely stated plan. This illustration of the onward surge of History I have always preferred to the one first quoted. And throughout the long annals of the human race religion, as its very name implies, has been the chiefest influence in the inter-relationships of men. The ethical codes of Confucius, of Brahma, of Buddha, of Mohammed, despite their earthly stains, have caused the coherence of untold millions, whilst the Old Testament and the pure teaching of the Meek Nazarine, have planted in the hearts of unnumbered throngs the tenderest yearnings to help one's fellows. And to every good man from the Beginning until now has come the longing to Do Justice, To Love Mercy and to walk humbly with his God. So ran the world away through the Ancient Times, through the Middle Ages, until those days in Olde Englande "when civil fury first grew high and men fell out they knew not why," and "pulpit

drum ecclesiastic was beat with fist instead of a stick," until, indeed, there had arrived the days of that most unhappy king, the first Charles of England. Perhaps the political differences of his people, might not have produced civil war; but their seeking to promote what seemed to each faction the truths of religion, brought on their dreadful internecine struggle. All factions desired a National Church. The question was, should that Church be Roman, Anglican or Puritan; should it be governed by Bishops or by Presbyters; were the theological doctrines of Trent, of Augsburg or of Geneva to rule in Great Britain? For the religious compromise of Elizabethan days, with its "Act of Supremacy," its "Act of Uniformity" and its "Thirty-nine Articles," had lost general favor and irked the zealous adherents of Rome or of Geneva. The Church of Rome was firm as crystal in its tenets, and the Genevans—the Presbyterian Church—were equally set in its doctrinal beliefs. In the swing and sway of the popular mind throughout the past few reigns—through the sometimes barbarous though mainly statesmanlike handling of religious questions under the great Elizabeth—through Mary's doings—through the tolerant Protestantism of James and the narrowness of Charles—through the flux of all those troublous times—there remained steadfast, militant, girding for the fray, the two opposing absolutisms—the Roman and the Genevan, which latter became in England the Puritan. Now, the Roman party was united. The Puritan consisted:—

First, of the Evangelical Churchmen, or Conforming Puritans, who accepted Episcopacy, but not the "right divine" of kings:

Secondly, the Presbyterian, demanding exclusive ascendancy, and that the National Church be modeled precisely as John Calvin's Commentaries set forth; and the Presbyterian Church asserted its "right divine" no less stoutly than the Stuart kings asserted theirs:



Thirdly, the Independents or Congregationalists, destined, because of their votary Cromwell, their victories in battle and their individuality, congregation by congregation, to predominate in the Puritan triumph.

The Anglican party became submerged after a concentrated effort to subjugate the Calvinistic spirit in the Reformed Church of England, or, as Archbishop Laud put it, "to have recognized the Divine Origin and rights of Episcopacy, the Apostolic succession, the necessity of a visible Church, the doctrine of sacramental grace and the propriety of order, decency and reverence in Christian worship."

In the fierce struggle of the creeds the Roman lost first to Puritan; whereupon the Independents, led by the mighty Cromwell and asserting individualism as contrasted with the "right divine" of Presbyterianism, became the triumphant faction of the triumphant Puritans. All England was distraught: Sweet kindness from man to man was banished, because of doctrinal differences. Though the gentle Founder of Christianity had belonged to no denomination, and preached such broad and inclusive doctrine as the Sermon on the Mount, the Christians of England, in the days of Charles the First, grew to slaughter one another, because of petty differences in religious views. What a revolting spectacle to the thoughtful student of modern times! The political troubles under James I and Charles I, may be said roughly to resolve themselves into the various phases of the efforts of those Kings for absolutism, in opposition to the struggle of noble Englishmen to preserve those glorious precedents which, broadening slowly down, had come to make the English Constitution the freest then extant.

Such were the times—restless, bitter, furious, intolerant. Was there no refuge from such a welter? Did the lands beyond the seas, offer no nepenthe? Nay, they called for active spirits to subdue them: Peace for the troubled con-

science, Refuge from warring friends, Rest for the tired worker in old questions, and Dynamic work for one's family, for one's native land, and for the race, lay yonder beyond the broad Atlantic main. So, it seems to me, must have called the opportunities on this Continent, especially to the two earlier Calverts.

Sir George Calvert, trained man of affairs, ex-Secretary of State, of an adventurous turn of mind, one who had been a convinced Protestant, and had become an equally convinced Romanist, undismayed by his disastrous failure in trying to settle his grant of Avalon, in Newfoundland, determined to found a Colony, in which came to be called Maryland. He there designed tolerance of all Christian religions; he designed for himself abstraction and interest in founding here an enterprise far removed from the wrangling of his old associates; he designed here to nurse the fortunes of his family; but, above all, he, the veteran Statesman, designed to establish so far as might be, the Utopian settlement dreamed of by the good and great Sir Thomas More, where Separation of Church and State, Freedom of Religious Worship according to any Christian form, and Manhood Suffrage could be practiced. Sir George Calvert, created Lord Baltimore in 1624, died two months before the Charter of Maryland passed the Great Seal, and it was granted to his eldest son Cecilius, second Lord Baltimore, who was fully sympathetic with all his father's plans and "trod in his paths." Upon both their minds, had shone the Utopian views of the great Chancellor Sir Thomas More, through the curious happening, that his great-grandson, Father Henry More, who, like all the Chancellor's descendants, venerated all his views, was the close comrade of the first Lord Baltimore when Secretary of State, and, it is believed, both his chaplain in his retirement and the tutor of his son Cecilius. Under all these ameliorating influences, then, did Cecilius, second Lord Baltimore, calm

and statesmanlike and steady and of sturdy businesslike disposition, take up the task of settling his Palatinate of Maryland. Tolerance, Peace, Success were the main motives actuating him. Charles the First, who granted the charter was a Protestant; Cecilius Calvert was a Romanist. The charter called for Freedom of Religious worship according to any Christian form. Cecilius Calvert's letter of instruction to the little band of two hundred colonists in the Ark and the Dove inculcated that same tolerance in religion; and that one hundred and twenty-eight of the two hundred colonists, took the oath of "allegiance," just prior to embarking, proves that number to have been Protestants; and as the other seventy two are not recorded as so declaring themselves, we may conclude, that they were Romanists. These seventy-two, who had "forsaken the ship" prior to the administering of the oath of "allegiance," re-embarked at the Isle of Wight, but many others who had disembarked with them, did not rejoin the little squadron. Turn to Volume V, Archives of Maryland: Proceedings of the Council, 1667-1687, pp. 267-268, and read what testimony, Charles, third Lord Baltimore, son of Cecilius, and from 1661 till 1675, resident Governor of Maryland, gave in writing in 1678, to the Lords of the Committee of Trade and Plantations, as to the toleration exacted by the colonists before sailing, and explaining, why it would be dangerous to scrutinize the religious complexion of the colonists in Maryland, and asserting, that making exhaustive scrutinies "would certaynly either endanger Insurrections or a General Dis-peopling of the Provynee, which is at present in great peace and Quiett, all persons there being secured to their content, for a quiett enjoyment of everything that they cann Reasonably desyne. The Reason why such scrutinyes would be thus Dangerous, is that vizt, That at the first planteing of this Provynee by my ffather, Albeit he had an absolute Liberty given him and his heirs to carry thither any Persons out of

any of the Dominions that belonged to the Crowne of England who should be found wylling to goe thither, yett when he came to make use of this Liberty, He found very few who were inclyned to goe and seat themselves in those parts. But such as for some Reason or other could not lyve with ease in other places. And of these a great parte, were such as could not conforme in all particulars to the severall Lawes of England relateing to Religion; many they were of this sort of People who declared their Wyllingness to goe and plant themselves in this Provynce, soe as they might have a Generall Toleraccon settled there by a Lawe by which all of all sorts who professed Christianity in Generall, might be at Liberty to worship God in such manner as was most agreeable with their respective Judgement and Consciences, without being subject to any penaltyes whatsoever, for their soe doeing, Provyded the Civill peace were preserved. And that for the securing the civill peace and preventing all heats Feuds, which were generally observed to happen, amongst such as differ in opynions upon Occasion of Reproachful Nicknames and Reflecting upon each other's Oppynions, it might by the same Lawe be made Penall to give any offence in that kynde. These were the condicons proposed by such as were willing to goe and be the first planters of this Provynce, and without the complying with these condicons, in all probability This Provynce had never beene planted. To these condicons, my ffather agreed, and accordingly soon after the first planteing of this Provynce, these conditions by the unanimous consent of all who were concerned, were passed into a Lawe and the inhabitants of this Provynce have found such effects from this Lawe and from the strict observance of it as well in relation to their Quiett as in Religion to the farther peopleing of this Provynce That they looke on it, as that whereon alone depends the preservation of their Peace Their Propertyes and their Libertyes. This beinge the true state of the case of this

Provyunce it is easy to Judge what consequenyes might ensue, upon any scrutinyes which should be made in order to the satisfyeing theis particular Inquiries."

Plainly the Colony of Maryland was intended by its owner and the colonists to be "The Land of the Sanctuary," and not in any sense a polemical ground. Today the blessed recognition of the fact, that the spirit of belief, and not its formal expression, is the solemn need of every human soul has swept gloriously forward; but two and three-quarter centuries ago, that truism found affirmation in no country, save the little Colony of Maryland. And here, too, Cecilus Calvert inaugurated separation of Church and State. And here, also, he inaugurated in modern times, the doctrine of one vote to every freeman. Has Maryland retained those three helpful characteristics with which she started, or has she improved them or lost them? Plainly, she has shared with all the Western World, in the growth unto full tolerance, of every form of pure religious worship. Therein our beloved State has markedly improved.

And there has been no retrogression as to separation of Church and State.

But how as to the equality of voting of every freeman?

In the early days of Cecilus Calvert, every freeman was summoned to the General Assembly; and in the later portion of his government, when population had grown much greater, every freeman in every "hundred," was allowed to vote as to who should be that hundred's representative, and even then, might elect to personally appear and vote in the General Assembly.

Today our condition is sadly changed from that equal representation.

Certain Electoral Districts of Maryland, inhabited by, say, twenty-two per cent. of the total population of the State, re-



turn a majority of the Legislature. If any man, or group of men, desire to control legislation, or legislative offices, or legislative franchises and privileges, the patent way is to control elections in the Electoral Districts I have indicated. Clearly, the easy way to do that, is to control the make-weight vote of the dominant party in that party's primary, and thereby gain the nomination, and the adherence, of that blind group of voters, who always vote their party ticket. Now, if any man, or group of men, in Maryland be willing to use money, promise of office or of political co-operation in order to purchase the support of enough of the make-weight vote in the Electoral Districts I have mentioned as returning a majority of the Legislature, so as to secure the nomination by the dominant party of the candidates of that man, or of that group of men, they will find, that the last Legislature made it perfectly safe to attempt it, by enacting that in a legalized primary, a ballot may be prepared away from the voting booth. Such provision can segregate seller and buyer beyond any possibility of betrayal, for at the very utmost, an accusation of bribery, could be met by flat denial, incapable of correction. Such a system admits the safe expenditure by one man, or by a group of men, of whatever sums or other considerations are needed, to buy the success of the favored faction, in any Electoral District's struggle in the primaries. The favored faction, thus securing the label of the dominant party for its nominees, almost inevitably elects them. This process applied throughout the State produces a majority of the Legislature. Now, under such circumstances, would that majority feel under obligations to the respective organizations of the Electoral Districts which had processed them into office? Would the Electoral District organizations feel under obligations to the man, or men, who put up money or other considerations to buy the possibility of their being retained in local control? If so, they and their legislative nominees

would naturally vote office, legislation or opportunity to the providers of the money, which had enabled them to conquer. Does this oligarchical method of control exist in Maryland, or do the 78 per cent. of our population return a majority of the Legislature? Ah! it is 22 per cent. of our population that returns a majority of the Legislature! Then majority rule has been abandoned in this good old colonial State, and we think grossly unequal representation in the Legislature, is consonant with our doctrine of the Revolutionary struggle, which declared against taxation without representation! What is this gross inequality of representation in the Legislature? Why, in some cases it is unequal in the proportion of one to eight, for in one County two hundred and fifty voters can constitute a member of the Legislature, whilst it takes two thousand Baltimore voters to constitute one. To permit twenty-two per cent. of the population, to hold seventy-eight per cent. of it in subjugation, is very acceptable to exploiters of the situation, of course, but sufficiently accounts for oft-repeated failures to develop Maryland at large. And, more concretely, it explains, why Baltimore, inhabited by nearly half of the population of Maryland, and paying approximately three-fourths of all the taxes of the State, makes no greater advance than she does. Now, any failure in the growth and facilities of Baltimore, is a serious blow to every Marylander, and to every Maryland interest. How does our oligarchical system hold back the development of Baltimore, which pays nearly three-quarters of all the taxes of the State? In many ways: For example:—

First—The Legislatures, elected as I have shown, have by statutes exempted from State taxation, every financial obligation put out by any Maryland County; but every financial obligation of the City of Baltimore held by any inhabitant of a County, has to have State taxes paid upon it;

Second—The vast preponderance of license taxes are paid by Baltimore City, but ~~hardly~~ <sup>nearly</sup> all of those taxes are taken by the rest of the State;

Third—The School Fund, contributed chiefly by Baltimore City, is taken largely by the rest of the State;

Fourth—The Good Roads Five Million loan, is based upon the responsibility of Baltimore to the extent of about seventy-five per cent.; but will Baltimore receive even twenty-five per cent. of it? These illustrations will suffice.

And if these illustrations are accurate, it is evident that Baltimore, so deprived of the local spending power of most of the great sums she thus pays, must yet defray her local bills, and must forego many a needed improvement and facility. Under stress of these conditions, she has been forced to a most detrimental basis of taxation on real estate, and has been kept from that broad-gauged treating of possible new capital and opportunities, which many of her rival cities enjoy. Why should Baltimore banking capital be taxed about five times as much as Philadelphia banking capital? Why should not Baltimore develop a freight road from its manufacturing centre to some common shipping point, reached through a reciprocal switching charge? Which of the other great cities of this country lacks that facility? Why does Baltimore languish comparatively in a business way and incidentally injure all Maryland thereby? I will tell you: Her population, numbering nearly seven hundred thousand—that is, nearly half of the population of Maryland—are content to have only about one-fifth of the members of the Legislature, and to be mulcted of their money and to be held down by those provisions of our laws which keep all this dear old State, at the mercy of a minority who perpetuate their power as I have indicated.

Pardon me, if in contrast to the third great principle which this man, Cecilius Calvert, implanted in Maryland—I mean



the principle of equal representation of the voters in their framing of the laws—pardon me, I say, if in contrast with that principle of equal representation, the actual and baneful and grossly unequal representation of the voter in framing the laws through which our beloved State must now be helped, or held back, has moved me to this individual protest, against the unfairness and the untowardness, to which in this regard, we have descended since the days of the Founder of Maryland.

Not equal representation, but the absurd reverse of it, handicaps Maryland today, and the corollaries, unequal taxation, and opportunities made unequal through consequent legislation, burden and weaken the normal Marylander, and present to him a ludicrous contrast with that maxim of the Revolutionary days, which declared against Taxation without Representation.

But I have held you too long, while I unavoidably dwelt upon the historical contrast between the old standards and the new.

I turn now to the very complimentary and grateful duty which the Society of Colonial Wars in the State of Maryland has kindly assigned to me. They have commissioned me, Mr. Mayor, to present to this fair City of Monuments, another monument in the form of this statue of Cecilius Calvert, second Lord Baltimore, Founder of Maryland, and establisher for the first time in the English-speaking world, of Freedom of Worship, according to any Christian form, and of Separation of Church and State. Of his relationship towards equal representation of every voter in the framing of the laws of Maryland, I have spoken. I need not speak of the goodness of his character: God-led, he wrought for righteousness.

The statue of this man I present, in the name of the Society of Colonial Wars in the State of Maryland and of all who

have contributed to the construction of it, to the City of Baltimore, which was named in commemoration of his family, and I humbly pray, that all the Wisdom, Freedom and Fairness which he typified, may yet fill our Commonwealth and endure beyond the life of this perpetual bronze, which showeth forth Cecilius Calvert, Founder of Maryland.

DE COURCY W. THOM.

Baltimore, Md., November 21st, 1908.













0 014 368 128 2 ●